

REMARKS

This is in full and timely response to the above-identified Office Action. The above listing of the claims supersedes any previous listing. Favorable reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested in view of the preceding amendments and the following remarks.

In this response, claims 1-15 and 18-25 are cancelled without disclaimer or prejudice while claim 16 is amended to incorporate the limitations of claims 18-25. Claim 16 has also been revised to improve syntax and form. For example, the recitation of the detachable connector means, which is neither mentioned nor identified in the rejection, has been moved to a more appropriate location to obviate potential antecedent basis problems which have been inadvertently overlooked.

Rejections under the 35 USC § 102 statute, are based on the premise that to anticipate a claim, each and every element of the claim must be shown in a single reference. When a claimed element cannot be found in the reference, the reference does not anticipate the claimed invention. Further, it is incumbent upon the Examiner to identify where in the reference each element may be found. *Ex parte Levy*, 17 U.S.P.Q.2d 1461 (Bd. Pat. App. Intrf. 1990). Consequently, when an Examiner fails to identify a claimed element, the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation. Here, the failure to identify the detachable connector means is alone seen as rendering the anticipation of claim 1 under 35 USC § 102(b), moot.

Further, claim 16, in addition to the detachable connector means also recites a TV receiving module, and a display apparatus, the display apparatus controls a TV receiving module using an external control signal. However, the cited references do not disclose the detailed constituent structure of the TV receiving module, or the detailed constituent structure of the tuner means in the TV receiving module, as now recited in claim 16. This also renders both the anticipation and obviousness rejections untenable.

Yet further, the CRT & YOKE 30 of the reference to Gardner et al. cannot control a receiver 10, therefore the cited references do not disclose the display apparatus that controls the TV receiving module nor the detailed constituent structure of the display apparatus as now recited in claim 16.

Further, none of the cited references disclose the detailed constituent structure of the first connector and the second connector. Particularly, the cited references do not disclose such terminals of the first connector and the terminals of the second connector that are implemented


using pins (pin shape), respectively. Indeed, it must be noted that the neither of the rejections addresses the issue of the pins and in fact the Office Action is entirely devoid of this term. Furthermore, when electronically searched neither of the Gardner et al. and Jung references even mentioned the term "pin." The ramification of this is clear. The claimed requirement of the pin implemented connections have not been addressed in a manner which allows a *prima facie* rejection under either § 102 or § 103 to be sustained.

Therefore, the structure as set forth in amended claim 16 is, for at least the reasons advanced above, both distinct and non-obvious over the disclosure of the cited references, and it is respectfully submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn.

The rejections under 35 USC §§ 102, 103 are therefore respectively traversed for at least the proceeding reasons.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,


LOWE HAUPTMAN & BERNER, LLP

Benjamin J. Hauptman
Registration No. 29,310

Customer Number: 22429
1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: November 30, 2006
BJH/KT/ayw